



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Would it not be easy for the Industrial Council to encourage certain foundation principles between those who employ, and those whose manual labor produces the final result in industry?

The first essential for peaceful working is that "all the cards shall be upon the table." Ignorance is the parent of mistrust. Surely if the exact position were shown to men by the employer, it would generally be seen that all the wiser heads of businesses were anxious in their own interest to pay more and not less wages. In America men are warned that if they cannot earn up to a certain standard they are not worth employing. As a rule, the higher the wages the greater the production, and the cheaper the product. If employers are frank with the men there must be similar openness on the other side. Then there will grow up a desire throughout the whole business to work with heart to produce the best possible. This will brighten the whole industrial life, and a contented working class means a rapidly developing trade.

I regard this kind of industrial life as something likely to make this earth a little more like heaven, this world more like what God would have it be. Therefore I trust the day is very near when the Industrial Council will be used to the fullest extent, labor unrest being thereby killed, and our England not only a more prosperous, but a happier and a nobler land.

H. R. BIRMINGHAM.

OUR SOLDIERS AND PROHIBITION

SIR,—More than a million and a half American voters are coming back to the United States this year, or next, with some definite plans about the elections in 1920. They know quite well that, in addition to their own ballots, they will have a far-reaching influence on the political developments of the next sixteen months. For that reason, it may interest you to know how the members of the American Expeditionary Forces in France and Germany are discussing the questions that are now coming to the front.

It is a serious mistake to believe that the doughboys will favor a Presidential candidate drawn from the personnel of the army. Very frankly, they are weary of army life, army authority, and the glamor of military pomp. They enthuse over some officers, but the objects of their sincere regard are the men who actually led them in the fighting. Some colonels, captains and lieutenants might control the ballots of their own companies or regiments, but officers of higher rank would not be flattered by an accurate forecast of the votes they could command in the American army.

The American soldier is, as the English say, thoroughly "fed up" on military control and would flinch from the thought of placing in the White House a man selected from military circles. In an overwhelming majority of cases the doughboy's one ambition is to get out of uniform and settle down to the job of winning the battles of peace. His vote will go to the man who in his opinion is best suited to the task of restoring and maintaining national prosperity.

As a general rule, the doughboy will come back home with some deep-rooted theories about what he considers unfair treatment. He believes that he has been charged exorbitant prices by the French. He

thinks that, after risking his life for his country, he should have been given a chance to get back to the United States before the men in the training camps with a record of only a few months' service were released and given a first chance to find good jobs. And he regards the prohibition amendment as a distinct violation of his rights as an American citizen.

It is quite useless to argue these points with a majority of the men in northern France and Germany. They balance the present cost of commodities in France with pre-war prices in the United States and insist that profiteering is responsible for what they regard as a series of hold-ups. If, on the theme of their retention on foreign duty, you point out the mechanical impossibility of transporting troops from America to relieve them, they counter with the argument that "the first troops sent back from France were the last troops to get here." This, of course, is true. But, instead of being flattered by the fact that the War Department reposes more confidence in them than in the untested products of the training camps, they stick to their argument that they "earned the right to go home first and let the other fellow do the policing and road-repairing."

Every doughboy with whom I have discussed the question, regardless of his personal habits, is exceedingly bitter on the subject of the prohibition amendment. The American soldiers insist that politicians took advantage of their absence from home to "put over" the bone-dry law. The fact that the question was not put to a popular vote does not alter their convictions. They think it was a "crooked deal" to make a radical change in the Constitution while two million voters were fighting for that Constitution on foreign soil and unable even to voice their opinions. The men in the A. E. F. will return with a distinct grudge against the national and State legislators who favored a change in the Constitution while the war was being fought and won.

The American soldier has had no chance to talk since he was sent to France, but he will have a great deal to say when he returns. And some of the things he is waiting to say will exert a tremendous influence on the next national election.

A NEWSPAPER CORRESPONDENT JUST BACK FROM FRANCE.

A LITTLE HISTORY

SIR,—Concerning current discussions as to the League and the Nation, the following may be of interest: The Colonists, prior to the Declaration of Independence, acted as one people. The first Continental Congress, which assembled at Philadelphia, September 5, 1774, adopted a Declaration of Rights, October 14, 1775. In its introductory sentence it recites that "Since the last war, the British parliament, claiming a power of right to bind the people of America, by statutes in all cases whatsoever, hath, etc." The declaration part begins with the mention of it as the action of, "The good people of the several colonies," and proceeds to include those of New Hampshire and all the others except Georgia. By the Declaration of Rights, it was resolved, that certain acts of parliament were "Infringements and violations of the rights of the Colonists." It declared "That the inhabitants of the